

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Viginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,964	09/24/2003	Tai-Hsiung Wu	P-3641.256	4873
7590 04/14/2005		EXAMINER		
Jackson Walker L.L.P. Suite 2100			LUGO, CARLOS	
112 E. Pecan St	reet		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Antonio, T	X 78205		3676	
			DATE MAILED: 04/14/2009	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
·	10/669,964	WU, TAI-HSIUNG	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Carlos Lugo	3676	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a . I reply within the statutory minimum of thin riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI atute. cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	4 September 2003.		
_	This action is non-final.		
Since this application is in condition for allocal closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the condition of the condition is in condition for allocal conditions.	wance except for formal mat		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 Applicant may not request that any objection to t Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[the drawing(s) be held in abeyar rection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a line.	ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)		,	ļ
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview 5	fummary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 290,931 to Reynolds et al (Reynolds '931) in view of US Pat No 1,620,544 to Greive.

Reynolds '931 discloses a locking device comprising a mounting plate (B) having multiple L-shaped legs (M) oppositely formed on opposite sides of a face of the mounting plate and a ear (at R) formed on a peripheral side face of the mounting plate and having a first hole defined through the ear.

A base (A) has multiple holes (C and E) defined to correspond to the L-shaped legs so that the L-shaped legs can be inserted into the holes to secure engagement between the mounting plate and the base. The base further has a second hole to receive a bolt through both holes.

However, Reynolds '931 fails to disclose multiple pairs of legs and holes. Reynolds '931 discloses multiple legs and holes but not in pair.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have "multiple pairs" of legs and holes since the duplicating

the components of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art that will not affect the mechanism of the locking device.

Also, Reynolds '931 fails to disclose that the base includes a second ear that includes the second hole. Reynolds discloses that the mounting plate includes an ear (surface extending beyond the main body of A, Figure 2) and at the base only a hole.

Greive teaches that it is well known in the art to have a mounting plate (15) that includes a first ear (at 16) and that the base includes a second ear (surface extending beyond the main body of (at 3).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a locking device that comprises first and second ears, as taught by Greive, into a device as described by Reynolds '931, since a change in the shape of a prior art device is a design consideration within the level of skill of one skilled in the art that will not affect the mechanism of the locking device.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlos Lugo whose telephone number is 571-272-7058. The examiner can normally be reached on 10-7pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/669,964

Art Unit: 3676

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR

only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Carlos Lugo Examiner Art Unit 3676

April 6, 2005.

DANIEL P. STODOLA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**

aniel P Stodola

Page 4